

Appl. No. 10/657,415
Amdt. Dated October 30, 2006
Reply to Office Action of August 1, 2006

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 30 2006

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed August 1, 2006. In the Office Action, (i) claims 42 and 43 were objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c); (ii) claims 31, 32, 36, 37, 47 and 49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 (second paragraph); and (iii) claims 17, 18, 31, 32, 41-45, 47 and 49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 42 and 43 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 31 and 36 have been amended to address alleged informalities raised by the Examiner. Claims 17-18, 31-32, 36-37, 41, 44-45 and 47-48 have been rejected. Claims 24-30 remain withdrawn. Reconsideration in light of the amendments and remarks made herein is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claims 42 and 43 were objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c). Applicants have cancelled claims 42 and 43 without prejudice. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 31, 32, 36, 37, 47 and 49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicants have amended claims 31 and 36 to correct minor informalities. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the outstanding § 112 rejection as applied to claims 31-32, 36-37, 47 and 49.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 17, 18, 31, 32, 41-45, 47 and 49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lau (U.S. Patent No. 5,825,084) in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA). It is note that claims 36-37 have not been cited as being rejected under § 103(a) but subsequent discussion is directed to these claims. Also, claim 29 is identified as allegedly being taught by the references, but no confirmation of claim 29 being reinstated has been received to date.

Appl. No. 10/657,415
Amdt. Dated October 30, 2006
Reply to Office Action of August 1, 2006

Presuming that claims 36-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and claim 29 remains in withdrawn status, Applicants still respectfully traverse the rejection because a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

As the Examiner is aware, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify a reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. See MPEP §2143; see also *In Re Fine*, 873 F. 2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Herein, at a minimum, the combined teachings of the cited references fail to describe or suggest *all* of the claim limitations. *Emphasis added.*

With respect to independent claims 17 and 31, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Lau nor the Admitted Prior Art teaches or suggests the following limitation:

removing a second portion of the conductive material along the inside surface of the bond shelf to form a pair of separate conductive strips along the inside surface of the bond shelf *with a first conductive strip of the pair of conductive strips coupled to a first bonding pad of the plurality of bonding pads coupled to a first power bus having a first voltage level and a second conductive strip of the pair of conductive strips coupled to a second bonding pad of the plurality of bonding pads coupled to a second power bus having a second voltage level less than the first voltage level, the first power bus and the second power bus are located in a same horizontal plane of the integrated circuit package.*
Emphasis added.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Admitted Prior Art clearly states that "an integrated circuit may require both 3.3 V and 2.0 V power. The additional voltage level requires an *additional conductive power plane* within the package." *Emphasis added; see page 2, lines 9-14 of the Specification.* Therefore, the combination of the teachings of Lau and the Admitted Prior Art teach a multiple power planes to support integrated

Appl. No. 10/657,415
Amdt. Dated October 30, 2006
Reply to Office Action of August 1, 2006

circuits of different voltage levels, which teaches away from the claimed invention that enables the establishment of multiple power busses within the same power plane.

Hence, it is respectfully submitted that the combined teachings of Lau and Admitted Prior Art do not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, and as a result, withdrawal of the outstanding §103 rejection is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/657,415
Amdt. Dated October 30, 2006
Reply to Office Action of August 1, 2006

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 30 2006

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: October 30, 2006

By


William W. Schaal

Reg. No. 39,018

Tel.: (714) 557-3800 (Pacific Coast)

12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/TRANSMISSION (37 CFR 1.84)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date shown below, being:

MAILING

☐ deposited with the United States Postal Service
as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:
Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450,
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date: 10/30/06

FACSIMILE

☒ transmitted by facsimile to the Patent and
Trademark Office.


Susan McFarlane

10/30/06

Date